

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on October 23, 2003 as well as the art cited has been reviewed. Claims 1-16 are pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bahlmann, (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,689) (referred to here as “Bahlmann”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of the present application has been amended. Amended claim 1 is directed to a provisioning database comprising “a first data structure containing provisioning information for a plurality of globally accessible configuration resources that are globally accessible by a plurality of provisioning servers” and “a second data structure containing provisioning information for a plurality of restricted configuration resources access to which by the plurality of provisioning servers is restricted.”

The Office Action notes that that “the provisioning data can be accessed by anyone through ... a web server and a browser, with a user level assigned by the administrator; it is up to the administrator to decide which *user* has access to which provisioning data or even every *user* can have access to some provisioning data and setting user access rights is an age old technology also.” Office Action, paragraph 2 (emphasis added). Elsewhere, the Office Action makes the point that “The difference in user access rights makes the distinction.”

However, claim 1 of the present application has been amended to indicate that that “a first data structure containing provisioning information for a plurality of globally accessible configuration resources *that are globally accessible by a plurality of provisioning servers*” and “a second data structure containing provisioning information for a plurality of restricted configuration resources *access to which by the plurality of provisioning servers is restricted*.” Bahlmann fails to teach or suggest this. The alleged teachings about “user access rights” are inapposite since, for example, FIG. 2 of Bahlmann indicates that the user 208 is different from the provisioning server programs 216 and 218.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1. Therefore, for at least those reasons given above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim 4 of the present application has been amended. Amended claim 4 is directed to a database having “a plurality of global components” and “a plurality of restricted components, the global components *accessible by a request from any of a plurality of provisioning servers*, and the restricted components having restricted access on a per request basis.” Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 4.

For at least those reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4 through 6 be withdrawn.

Claim 7 is directed to a provisioning database comprising “a first portion having a plurality of stored and uniquely identified sets of provisioning information, each of the sets associated with one of a plurality of external provisioning server and accessible only to its associated provisioning server.” The provisions database further comprises “a second portion having a plurality of stored sets of provisioning information for a plurality of external user access devices, each of the sets globally accessible for provisioning any of the plurality of external user access devices.”

Bahlmann fails to teach or suggest all the features recited in claim 7 of the present application. For example, Bahlmann fails to teach or suggest “each of the sets associated with one of a plurality of external provisioning server and *accessible only to its associated provisioning server*.” The statements in the Office Action related to “user access rights” are inapplicable to this language of claim 7.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1. Therefore, for at least those reasons given above with respect to claim 7, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is directed to an access method for controlling access to a database having a global portion and a restricted portion. The method comprises “identifying a host device requesting access to the restricted portion”, “allowing access to a subsection of the restricted portion containing provisioning information for the particular requesting host device”, and “allowing universal access to the global portion for provisioning a user access device.” Claim 11 depends from claim 10.

Claim 12 is directed to a provisioning method that comprises “receiving a configuration request from a host at a provisioning database”, “identifying the host”, and “configuring the host using restricted access configuration information stored in the provisioning database”. Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 12.

The Office Action makes reference to action taken by a user 208 of Bahlmann and the processing of “user access rights.” In other words, Bahlmann relates to authorization based on the identity of a user. However, claim 10 recites *“identifying a host device requesting access to the restricted portion”* and *“allowing access to a subsection of the restricted portion containing provisioning information for the particular requesting host device.”* Claim 12 recites *“receiving a configuration request from a host at a provisioning database”*, *“identifying the host”*, and *“configuring the host using restricted access configuration information stored in the provisioning database.”* These features are neither taught nor suggested by Bahlmann.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 10 and 12 be withdrawn.

Claim 11 depends from claim 10 and claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 12. Therefore, for at least those reasons given above with respect to claims 10 and 12, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11, 13, and 14 be withdrawn.

Claim 15 has been amended. Amended claim 15 is directed to a method of storing provisioning information. The method comprises “creating first and second storage portions of a provisioning database,” “storing configuration information for a plurality of user access devices in the first portion,” “identifying the first portion for global access by any of a plurality of external servers,” and “storing configuration information for a plurality of external provisioning servers in the second portion.” The method further comprises “assigning each of the plurality of external provisioning servers a unique identifier,” “tagging the configuration information for each of the external provisioning servers with the unique identifier for that particular provisioning server,” and “retrieving only the configuration information tagged with the unique identifier of an external provisioning server requesting configuration information in response to a request from the external provisioning server requesting configuration information.”

With respect to the language “retrieving only the configuration information tagged with the unique identifier of an external provisioning server requesting configuration information” of claim 15, the Office Action takes the position Bahlmann teaches that a “user can add, view, modify, delete, generate report on each vendor’s provisioning servers configuration data thru an unique interface.” However, such actions by a *user* in do not relate to “retrieving … in response to a request from the *external provisioning server* requesting configuration information” as recited in amended claim 15 of the present application.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that this rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

Claim 16 has been amended. Amend claim 16 is directed to a network system, comprising a central provisioning database and a plurality of provisioning servers. Claim 16 further recites “wherein the central provision database comprises a first data structure containing provisioning information for a plurality of globally accessible configuration resources that are globally accessible by the plurality of provisioning servers and a second data structure containing provisioning information for a plurality of restricted configuration resources access to which by the plurality of provisioning servers is restricted.”

For at least those reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 332-4720.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/23/2004

Jon M. Powers
Jon M. Powers
Reg. No. 43,868

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg and Associates, LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T - (612) 332-4720
F - (612) 332-4731